

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

2391st MEETING: 6 AUGUST 1982
UN LIBRARY

NEW YORK

JAN 1 1983

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2391)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 4 June 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15162);	
(b) Letter dated 28 July 1982 from the Permanent Representatives of Egypt and France to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15316)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/...) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2391st MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 6 August 1982, at 11.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Noel DORR (Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Panama, Poland, Spain, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2391)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 4 June 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15162);
 - (b) Letter dated 28 July 1982 from the Permanent Representatives of Egypt and France to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15316)

The meeting was called to order at 1.30 p.m.

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to apologize to members of the Council for beginning the meeting somewhat later than the hour which we had agreed on last night.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 4 June 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15162);
- (b) Letter dated 28 July 1982 from the Permanent Representatives of Egypt and France to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15316)

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings [2374th, 2375th, 2377th, 2385th and 2389th meetings], I invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to take places at the Council table; I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of

Cuba, Egypt, India and Pakistan to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Roa Kourí (Cuba), Mr. Moussa (Egypt), Mr. Krishnan (India) and Mr. Mahmood (Pakistan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them document S/15346, which contains the text of a letter dated 4 August from the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Secretary-General.

4. The first speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, and I now call on him.

5. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): While the Council is deliberating and Israel gains encouragement from the Council's failure to act, that country today, at 1430 hours Beirut time, bombarded the Sanai area, killing a number of people. A military spokesman announced this afternoon, Beirut time, that an estimated 250 people had been killed or wounded, most of them women and children, in an Israeli air raid on a building in the Sanai area of west Beirut, a site only some 100 metres from the office of the Prime Minister of Lebanon, Chafik Al-Wassan. The military spokesman said:

"This treacherous attack is a challenge to the world and to the decisions of the Security Council. It can only be explained as part of a campaign of genocide against the Lebanese and the Palestinian peoples."

6. The building that was hit housed primarily Palestinian refugees who had been driven from the Jisr Basha and Debai refugee camps in east Beirut in 1976. I hope that the Council feels that it is high time that some action be taken, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, to put an end to this genocide.

7. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Lebanon.

8. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): I should like to make my country's position *vis-à-vis* the draft resolution now before the Council [S/15347] quite clear and unequivocal.

9. We find it legitimate and natural that the Council should react to the decisions of the Government of Israel that were released today, decisions that could be said to be negative. However, our main concern, on behalf of which we have pleaded in the corridors of the Council and with every single Council member, is that the Council should preserve unanimity in its reaction and a measure of consensus that will enable it to continue to influence events in a positive manner and not give the Israeli Cabinet further licence to react in the same way it has been reacting and to resume hostilities.

10. Our position is that no party—neither the Israelis nor others—should in fact find in anything that happens here any encouragement to lessen the chances for peace. As representative of Lebanon, my main interest is that the war be stopped in time to preserve what is left of Beirut, what is left of Lebanon and what is left of the chances for peace. I trust—indeed, I am sure—that the Council will understand our plea and approach the matter from that perspective.

11. I would also like to make one final remark, since the report of the Secretary-General in pursuance of Security Council resolution 517 (1982) [S/15345 and Add.1] is before us here. My comment relates to document S/15345/Add.1. Paragraph 4 of the Israeli reply to the Secretary-General is particularly unacceptable to my Government for the following reasons. First, my Government stands firmly in support of Council resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982) and the other resolutions of the Council that clearly call for two things: a total and unconditional withdrawal by Israel and the cessation of all military activities in Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border.

12. In addition, the notion of symmetrical withdrawal, which is once more expressed here, is a notion that—as we have said before the General Assembly and before the Council on more than one occasion—we fear might be conducive to symmetrical presence, not to use the term “symmetrical occupation”. My Government has made it clear that we want all non-Lebanese forces out of Lebanon, not because this is an Israeli demand, but because this is a Lebanese demand, one expressed long before the Israeli invasion. Indeed—and I want to be very clear—we want all non-Lebanese armies, save, of course, for the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), that are not authorized, or are not eventually authorized by my Government, out of Lebanon. We state this not as an Israeli demand, but as a Lebanese demand. We cannot conceive of Israeli withdrawal being contingent on the withdrawal of others, nor can we conceive of the withdrawal of other, non-Lebanese forces as being contingent on Israeli withdrawal.

13. The PRESIDENT: Is the Council ready to proceed to vote on draft resolution S/15347, submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?

14. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Before we proceed to the vote, I should like to make a very brief statement.

15. We are at the present time talking about the need to implement the decisions taken by the Council, with the agreement of all of its members, in connection with Israel's aggression in Lebanon. The Council, whose patience has been exhausted, decided on 4 August, the day before yesterday, that if Israel did not implement even the most minimum demands of the Council, the Council would then consider the question of sanctions for such violations.

16. Yesterday, 5 August, Israel rejected even the minimum resolutions of the Council. In those conditions, the Soviet Union came to the Council, but not for a propaganda victory, as some representatives of the so-called free press have irresponsibly written. We came here, at a time which is critical for the fate of Lebanon and for the life of the Palestinian people, to propose to all members of the Council a responsible political approach.

17. Let us try once again, through our joint efforts, to take a first step, which, though small, is qualitatively new. Let us try to deflect what is happening on Lebanese territory and in the Middle East as a whole away from this madness of the unilateral application of force by States. How can we do that? We can do it if all the members of the Council, without exception, show serious and responsible readiness to implement the minimum provisions on which we have agreed in resolutions 516 (1982) and 517 (1982).*

18. The Soviet delegation is ready to make yet further efforts to achieve that constructive goal. It is ready to insert a change proposed to it by the delegation of one of the States members of the Council. We accept that change, which is that, in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution proposed by the Soviet Union, we delete the words “as a first step” and, instead, add the following words at the end of the paragraph: “until the full withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory”. As my delegation accepts that change, the revised paragraph 3 will read:

“3. *Decides* that, in order to carry out the above-mentioned decisions of the Security Council, all the States Members of the United Nations should refrain from supplying Israel with any weapons and from providing it with any military aid until the full withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory.”

* Mr. Blum (Israel) took a place at the Council table.

19. In the light of the importance of this moment, the Soviet delegation insists that the draft resolution proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as orally revised, be put to the vote immediately.

20. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council will note that the representative of the Soviet Union has put forward a revised version of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution and has read it out to us clearly.

21. I would ask at this stage whether the members of the Council are ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union in document S/15347.

22. I call now on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

23. Mr. LOUET (France) (*interpretation from French*): The Council has adopted unanimously, or nearly unanimously, a number of resolutions on Lebanon. In spite of the repeated appeals of the Council and the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General, my delegation notes that Israel has thus far refused to comply with those resolutions. The situation in Beirut is becoming increasingly tragic, especially for the civilian populations and, in view of what is happening in Beirut, for Lebanon as a whole.

24. Another draft resolution has been submitted to us [S/15347]. It envisages certain measures regarding military supplies. My delegation is convinced that those measures are justified until the full withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory. That is why we shall vote in favour of this draft resolution.

25. Mr. WHYTE (United Kingdom): My delegation has said it before, but we say it again: my Government is appalled by what is happening in Beirut. We have heard no acceptable justification for the carnage which is being wreaked by the Israel Defence Forces in Lebanon.

26. We voted in favour of Council resolutions 516 (1982) and 517 (1982); we want a cease-fire; we want United Nations observers. When we consider the draft resolution on which we are about to vote, we note that we are indignant at the refusal of Israel to comply with the decisions of the Council; we do condemn Israel for not implementing those resolutions; we do demand that Israel immediately implement those resolutions; and, concerning operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, my Government announced more than a month ago, at the end of June, that it had decided that no further licences for the supply of military equipment to Israel would be issued until further notice. That remains the policy of my Government.

27. However, we do not support this draft resolution. Bearing in mind the hasty manner in which it was introduced by its sponsor, and given that there has been no serious attempt, in our opinion, to take into

account the views of some of the parties to the conflict, especially the views of the Government of Lebanon, which were indicated by Mr. Tuéni just now, we do not consider that this draft resolution will make any positive contribution to the peace process in the Middle East. On the contrary, it is being widely predicted that this draft resolution will lead to a veto.

28. We agree with the view of Mr. Tuéni that it is exceedingly important at this juncture that the Council should endeavour to continue to proceed by consensus. The consequence of a veto, if there be a veto, will be not to build on the modest progress which we made in adopting resolutions 516 (1982) and 517 (1982); indeed, it is liable to send the wrong signal to Jerusalem.

29. To conclude, we have heard nothing constructive in the debate on this draft resolution. The most eloquent contribution to the proceedings of the Council in the early hours of this morning, in the view of this delegation, was the silence of the representative of Lebanon. No good, in our view, has been done by the introduction of this draft resolution. For those reasons, we will abstain.

30. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Israeli authorities openly refuse to implement resolutions 516 (1982) and 517 (1982), refuse to accept deployment by the Secretary-General of United Nations observers in and around Beirut to monitor the cease-fire and refuse to withdraw their aggressor troops to the positions they occupied prior to 1325 hours New York time on 1 August 1982.

31. The Chinese Government strongly condemns the position of the Israeli authorities of openly violating the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of stubbornly persisting in aggression. The situation in Lebanon is further deteriorating; the city of Beirut is faced with the danger of complete destruction; the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples may face even more large-scale massacres.

32. In accordance with paragraph 8 of resolution 517 (1982), in case of failure to comply by any of the parties to the conflict, the Council should consider adopting effective ways and means in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations to impose sanctions against Israel. It is now imperative that the Council fully discharge its duty of safeguarding international peace and security.

33. The Chinese delegation is of the view that, as a first step, the Israeli aggressor troops should immediately lift their siege of the city of Beirut, halt their offensive against west Beirut, withdraw their troops to positions occupied prior to 1 August and accept the presence of United Nations observers to monitor the cease-fire. After that, the Israeli authorities must also immediately, totally and unconditionally withdraw their troops from Lebanon.

34. The Chinese delegation is of the view that the text of draft resolution S/15347 represents the minimum. We also feel that the text is not sufficient: it falls short of what is required for immediately halting Israel's aggression. The Council should consider adopting stronger measures to sanction Israel.

35. Although draft resolution S/15347 is insufficient, we consider it acceptable as a preliminary measure of sanction. Therefore, the Chinese delegation will vote in favour of it.

36. The PRESIDENT: As there are no more speakers before the voting, I would propose to put the draft resolution to the vote. Since the draft resolution has been revised orally, and since it is short, I propose, in the interests of clarity, to read the revised version of the draft to the Council before we come to vote on it.

37. The draft resolution, in the form revised and presented orally by the representative of the Soviet Union, reads as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Deeply indignant at the refusal of Israel to comply with the decisions of the Security Council aimed at terminating the bloodshed in Beirut,

"1. Strongly condemns Israel for not implementing resolutions 516 (1982) and 517 (1982);

"2. Demands that Israel immediately implement these resolutions fully;

"3. Decides that, in order to carry out the above-mentioned decisions of the Security Council, all the States Members of the United Nations should refrain from supplying Israel with any weapons and from providing it with any military aid until the full withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory."

38. I now put to the vote draft resolution S/15347/Rev.1, as orally revised and as just read out by me.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: China, France, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Panama, Poland, Spain, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire

The result of the vote was 11 votes in favour, 1 against and 3 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, the negative vote being that of a permanent member of the Council.

39. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements after the voting.

40. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): The delegation of Jordan voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union because it reflects the deep outrage of all members of the international community towards the holocaust which aggressive Israel has been inflicting upon Lebanon, an independent sovereign State, and upon its people and their Palestinian refugee guests, whom Israel uprooted from their ancestral homeland 34 years ago.

41. In addition, the draft resolution strongly condemns Israel for not implementing resolutions 516 (1982) and 517 (1982), adopted unanimously, which demanded a cease-fire and the deployment of United Nations observers to monitor the situation on the ground, particularly in the light of Israel's deliberate duplicity and its deception of the world in alleging that it was in favour of adopting a diplomatic solution, when all along it was determined to resort to the genocidal military option which it has been relentlessly pursuing for 62 days.

42. In its resolution 517 (1982), the Council specifically decided to meet

"... in order to consider the report of the Secretary-General and, in case of failure to comply by any of the parties to the conflict, to consider adopting effective ways and means in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations."

Hence, operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution on which the Council has just voted includes an arms embargo until all Israeli forces have totally withdrawn from Lebanon.

43. It is sad to think that any country would continue to provide to an aggressive and expansionist Israel military hardware with which to finalize the destruction of a whole country—Lebanon, its people and the Palestinian people residing therein. We regarded the proposed punitive measure as no more than a first step, which should be followed by much sterner measures in the diplomatic, economic, military and other fields, as spelled out meticulously in the Chapter of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with enforcement measures. As I said, we regard this as a first step. As for the beleaguered and cannibalized people of Lebanon—whether Lebanese or their Palestinian refugee guests—their motto is: "We do not want your prayers; we want your assistance."

44. Israel has a stockpile of weapons and it is still being supplied with those weapons which are literally destroying every quarter, every building, every house in the capital of Lebanon. Surely, there must be a way for the collective will of the international community to put an end to this holocaust, which will

remain in infamy in the records of the period since the Second World War.

45. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): As representatives of my Government have stated many times before, the United States, particularly through the mission of Mr. Philip Habib, has been working intensively and with profound commitment to help bring about a negotiated settlement of the crisis in Beirut and in Lebanon. We believe that this mission offers the best hope for a settlement that will avoid further bloodshed, secure the withdrawal from Lebanon of all foreign forces and enable Lebanon to regain its sovereignty, its independence and its territorial integrity.

46. We shall support any action in the Council that will assist Mr. Habib in his mission. We have supported such actions in the Council. We have worked hard to achieve consensus in the Council during this crisis. At the same time, we shall do nothing that might in any way affect this mission adversely.

47. The United States has supported many resolutions during this protracted crisis in Lebanon. Last Sunday, we supported resolution 516 (1982), which authorized the Secretary-General, at the request of the Government of Lebanon, to deploy United Nations observers in and around Beirut. We wish to reaffirm our support for resolution 516 (1982) and its call for observers. We wish to emphasize as well that it is important that the modalities of the deployment should contribute to the negotiations and to the peaceful resolution of the conflict.

48. The Government of Lebanon has made it clear, as stated unequivocally to the Council, that it wishes the complete withdrawal of foreign forces from Lebanon, starting with the withdrawal of foreign forces from Beirut. My Government has always supported and continues to support the Government of Lebanon in this desire. We can only regret that the Council has been unable clearly to state this same support for the Government and for the people of Lebanon, the chief victims of this continuing tragedy.

49. As President Reagan said, we support a cease-fire in place, and by the term "a cease-fire in place" the President meant the position of forces on 1 August.

50. We voted against the draft resolution because it called for sanctions against Israel and because it was unbalanced and would not have contributed to our goal of achieving, through negotiations, a peaceful settlement.

51. We regret that one member of the Council has tried to polarize the situation within the Council. Indeed, my Government would like to suggest that the time has come to declare a cease-fire within the Council itself. This, we hope, will give the peace process a chance to work and to succeed.

52. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation, as I have already said, came to the Council with constructive intentions. That is the very reason why the Soviet delegation accepted the change suggested by one delegation, and I referred to that before. But I think that all the members of the Council are entitled to know one more fact.

53. Approximately half an hour before this meeting of the Council began, the Soviet representative was approached by one delegation, a responsible delegation member of the Council. The Soviet representative was asked a question: would the Soviet Union be ready to consider the possibility of reaching agreement with regard to a final text of the Soviet draft resolution that would enable us to have a positive vote, at least by all five permanent members of the Security Council? I shall be blunt: we were talking about a positive vote by the United States delegation.

54. The representative who approached me with that question was given the following answer: the Soviet delegation is of course prepared to consider a concrete proposal, concrete wording, by the United States with regard to the Soviet draft resolution in the Council.

55. At that time it was emphasized that the Soviet delegation was prepared to do that only if a concrete amendment was involved and not some vague kind of wording. A short while later, the Soviet delegation was informed that the United States delegation had nothing to say to the delegation of the Soviet Union.

56. Thus, the responsibility of the United States for what has taken place today is clear. For each further step of the Israeli occupiers into Lebanese territory, for each Lebanese and Palestinian child who is killed, for each old person who is killed, for each woman who is killed, I say that the responsibility for all of that will be borne not only by Israel but also by the United States.

57. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): I wish to commend my distinguished friend from the Soviet Union for being a loyal and dedicated servant of his Government. In common with his Government, he chooses to remake and recast history to his own devices.

58. The United States made it clear to many representatives around this table, to you, Mr. President, and indirectly therefore to the representative of the Soviet Union, that we were prepared at all times to consider any reasonable alternative text, any productive alternative text, any text of a draft resolution that in our judgement would contribute to the peace process in Lebanon. We remain committed to that goal.

59. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel wishes to speak. Before I call on him, I should like to make one comment as President.

60. We began the meeting by inviting him, among others, to take a place at the Council table in accordance with our previous decisions. We did in fact begin before he took his place. But I should like to assure him that no discourtesy was intended on my part. It was simply that, having announced last night that the meeting today would begin at 11.30 a.m., and having deferred it for some time while I undertook certain consultations, at a certain moment I felt that I had to begin the meeting. I would assure him, and indeed any Member of the United Nations invited to the Council table, that no discourtesy was intended on my part.

61. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Some of the speakers here today have in their statements distorted the position of my Government with regard to the issue before us. Although that position is well known, I deem it my duty, for the sake of clarity, to repeat it very briefly.

62. Israel fully supports the restoration of the sovereignty of Lebanon under the authority of its lawful Government within its internationally recognized boundaries, free from any foreign intervention. Israel supports the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanese territory. Lebanon legitimately belongs to its people and to its people alone, and, as I have repeatedly stated in the Council and elsewhere, Israel has no territorial ambitions whatsoever in Lebanon.

63. We are entitled to demand that proper arrangements be made to prevent Lebanese territory from being used again in the future as a staging ground for hostile activities and terrorist acts against Israel and its population.

64. Those are the basic principles on which our position with regard to the situation in Lebanon rests, and I believe they are shared by others in many parts of the world. They are certainly shared by the vast majority of the Lebanese people.

65. As the dust gradually settles, and as the picture emerges more clearly, it becomes obvious how relieved the population of the southern part of Lebanon is at the fact that the terrorist presence in that part of their country has been removed after seven long years of agony and suffering. We, at our Mission, receive a great number of communications from ordinary Lebanese, both in Lebanon and in this country, communications that contain encouragement for the Government and people of Israel and expressions of gratitude to them for having brought about the disappearance of the terrorist presence in the southern part of their country.

66. I am not going to detain the Council with all of those communications. Let me just read out passages

from a letter received yesterday from a gentleman I have never met. He writes:

"Allow me to thank you for your support and understanding of our problem. Without any doubt, all Lebanese people who believe in freedom pledge their support behind your action in Lebanon. It has been unfortunate that Israel's action was erroneously characterized as invasion. But we have confidence that the truth will always shine, and only those who are blind will not see that Israel's action was to liberate not only Lebanon but the whole free world from PLO terrorists and Syrian murderers.

"For generations to come, we Lebanese will remember our friends."

And here there is a quotation from what apparently is a proverb in Arabic: "Your friend is your needs answered", by Kahlil Gibran. "My family here and in Lebanon thank you for your support for our just cause." The letter is signed Elie Adam Naim, of Englewood, New Jersey.

67. It is not my intention to respond to the statements we have heard from the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I did so extensively at an earlier meeting of the Council today. Let me therefore only briefly say that I see no need on my part to respond to the expressions of vilification on the part of the leading imperialist Power of our time, the leading expansionist Power of our time, a Power that has installed the gulags to suppress and to oppress its own people. We are in no need of being taught decency and proper behaviour by the representative of the Soviet Union—any representative of the Soviet Union—so I will not address myself to his statements here today.

68. But I do wish to say a few words and address myself to the representative of another member of the Council, and I do so more in sorrow than in anger, because we have tremendous respect and admiration for his country. We believe not only that it is a great country but that its people is a great people, a people that has stood for many generations for those ideals that make life worth living. It is therefore with sorrow that we note that, as far as that particular country is concerned, today, 6 August 1982, will live on as a day of shame in infamy.

69. Let me read out to the representative of France a passage from the verbatim record of a previous meeting of the Council, and I shall do so in his own language:

"An army which sets up machine-guns in the centre of an area occupied by civilians assumes a heavy responsibility with regard to this civilian population. A town from which guns are fired on

troops elsewhere cannot claim to be an open town, immune from bombing.”* [819th meeting, para. 72.]

Those words were spoken in the Council by the representative of France, Mr. Georges-Picot, on 2 June 1958.

70. Of course, the event that prompted that statement by the representative of France was the episode of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef. Just to refresh the memory of those members of the Council who may be in need of it, Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef, on Tunisian territory, was used as a terrorist base from which French troops and civilians across the Tunisian border were harassed. And the French representative, rightly, made a point of emphasizing that fact. On the same occasion, he said:

“... I consider it my duty, in order to enable the Council to form an objective appraisal of the situation, to fill in the gaps in the Tunisian statement and to correct certain points which will make it clear to the President and the members of the Council that Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef was not an open town, but a military centre of the Algerian rebels, supported by the Tunisian Army and administration, a centre from which attacks were continually launched against the French forces.

“Long before the incident of 8 February 1958”, —which was the reason why the Council was discussing the issue—“Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef and its mine were used as a training centre for the rebels and as a transit point for the supply of arms to the Algerian rebellion. What amounted to a rebel garrison—averaging 500 to 700 men”—not 5,000 to 7,000—“was permanently established at the mine, while the families lived in the village. Units of recruits were stationed there, drew arms and for six weeks carried out intensive military training consisting of technical instruction on the spot, combat exercises in the hills to the north of the mine buildings, firing practice in the hills...” [Ibid., paras. 70 and 71.]

The French Government therefore concluded that in order to stop those terrorist activities it had to act. And how was that action characterized? Here I quote from the statement of Mr. Georges-Picot at the 820th meeting of the Council, on the same date:

“The French retaliation was no more than an act of legitimate self-defence. The local command in particular took constant care to avoid civilian losses, opening fire only as a last resort. A commando unit of armed Tunisian civilians, on the other hand, did not hesitate to set fire to two dwelling houses nor deliberately to use the village school as a base for directing fire on the French garrison,

thus making itself responsible for the death of the head of the school and of his family.

“... .

“While the fighting was going on, the Remada school was used by Tunisian armed units as a point from which to fire against the *bordj* occupied by the French troops.” [820th meeting, paras. 37 and 39.]

71. And the conclusion? It is to be found in Mr. Georges-Picot’s statement at the 819th meeting:

“France is justified in contending that the Tunisian Government has taken advantage of all the facilities accorded to it by France in order to give open and constantly increasing encouragement to supporters of a rebellion on French territory and that, in doing so, Tunisia has committed a definite breach of faith. The Tunisian Government has also failed to fulfil its obligations under the United Nations Charter, which requires it to live in peace and as a good neighbour with the other Members of the United Nations. Its attitude is directly contrary to the spirit of decisions taken by the General Assembly, which, in its resolution 288 A (IV) concerning the situation in Greece, called upon ‘Albania, Bulgaria and the other States concerned to cease forthwith rendering any assistance or support to the guerrillas in fighting against Greece, including the use of their territories as a base for the preparation or launching of armed actions’. Are we not facing a similar situation?” [819th meeting, para. 101.]

72. We have been exposed here, over the years, to a great deal of hypocrisy and bigotry and cynicism, and we know full well that when it comes to my country, a double standard is traditionally applied here. This has become the rule. We do not agree with this, we do not acquiesce in this, but we are not naïve. When the representative of France, however, engages in such exercises, I confess we find it very painful indeed, not for our sake but for the sake of France, which we respect and admire and which we will continue to respect and admire, despite its day of shame.

73. The PRESIDENT: I should like first to make a brief statement as President and then to make a statement in my capacity as representative of Ireland.

74. First, as President, I wish to state the following, in view of certain comments made earlier in our debate today. As President, I conceive it my duty, first, to preside over the proceedings of the Council and to try to order the business of the Council under the guidance of its members. I wish to do so fairly at all times. I believe it is also right for me, as President, to try wherever possible to maintain the unity and common purpose of the Council in dealing with any serious subject or situation.

* Quoted in French by the speaker.

75. In accordance with this view of my duties as President, I undertook certain contacts on an informal basis and on my own responsibility before our meeting started this morning. I would not normally refer to those contacts here, but since reference has already been made to them I think it right to clarify the situation. I would simply say that those contacts were informal, they were undertaken on my responsibility and they were undertaken in a wish to maintain the unity and common purpose of the Council, which I think has been broadly maintained since I assumed my functions on Sunday last.

76. At a certain point, I decided, on the basis of my own judgement, that those efforts were not likely to bear fruit. At that point, in response to the wishes of members of the Council, I began the present proceedings.

77. I make that statement simply to clarify references that have been made and to explain my own view of my functions as President.

78. I should now like to make a statement as representative of IRELAND.

79. The Council has been considering the situation created by the Israeli invasion of Lebanon since that invasion began two months ago. It has adopted a total of seven resolutions. None of these has so far been implemented. I think it necessary to summarize briefly what has happened here since early June.

80. On 5 June, immediately after the invasion, we adopted resolution 508 (1982). In that resolution, we called upon the parties to cease immediately and simultaneously all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border, and we set a deadline of 0600 hours local time on 6 June. That request was not complied with.

81. On the following day, 6 June, the Council adopted resolution 509 (1982). We demanded that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon, and we demanded that all parties observe strictly the terms of resolution 508 (1982). That resolution was not complied with. Israel's forces moved rapidly further into Lebanon, occupying the whole of southern Lebanon, and took up positions in and around the capital.

82. On 19 June, we adopted resolution 512 (1982). Among other things, that resolution called upon all parties to respect the rights of the civilian population. The conflict continued, and Israeli forces continued to press forward. The civilian population, particularly in west Beirut, suffered grievously.

83. In resolution 513 (1982), adopted on 4 July, we repeated our call for respect for the rights of the civilian populations, and we called further for the resto-

ration of the normal supply of vital facilities such as water, electricity, food and medical provisions. Israel, however, maintained its blockade of west Beirut.

84. On 29 July, by resolution 515 (1982), the Council demanded that Israel lift the blockade immediately in order to permit the dispatch of supplies to the civilian population and allow the distribution of aid. That resolution was not complied with.

85. A new stage in our work began last Sunday, 1 August. At that time, military activities in and around Beirut had intensified and repeated cease-fires had broken down. On Sunday last, by resolution 516 (1982), we again demanded an immediate cease-fire, and we authorized the Secretary-General to deploy immediately, on the request of the Government of Lebanon, United Nations observers who would help to maintain it in place by monitoring the situation. This, in our view, was very important. It would consolidate the fragile cease-fires, and we saw no reason why, without prejudice to larger issues, this should not be acceptable immediately to all parties. Two of the parties involved immediately accepted the deployment of observers. The third, Israel, responded that the matter had to be decided by its Cabinet, and that it would be so decided on 5 August [S/15345, para. 3]. The hostilities continued.

86. On Tuesday last, 3 August, I, as President, was authorized to make a statement expressing the serious concern of members of the Council and insisting that all parties observe strictly resolution 516 (1982) [S/15342]. Immediately thereafter, Israeli forces engaged in further major military activity, moving further into west Beirut and subjecting the city to further bombing and shelling. Firing continued on both sides in these circumstances.

87. On Wednesday, 4 August, the Council adopted resolution 517 (1982). We again demanded an immediate cease-fire and demanded that Israeli troops return to the positions they had occupied on Sunday, when resolution 516 (1982) was adopted, and we went so far as to censure Israel for its failure to comply with the Council's resolutions.

88. Yesterday, Israel specifically declined to co-operate with the Secretary-General in the deployment of observers in and around Beirut, in accordance with resolution 516 (1982) [see S/15345/Add.1]. Israeli troops have also not withdrawn to the positions they held last Sunday. Instead, there have been renewed attacks on Beirut.

89. Today, we have been called upon to consider once again the situation as I have described it. We are faced not with the problem of the non-implementation of a single resolution, but rather with a consistent and repeated failure to implement over several months and with the continuation of military activities and hostilities on both sides.

90. We have therefore had to address ourselves to the present draft resolution [S/15347/Rev.1]. In the statement which I made just now as President, I indicated that I, as President, had tried to maintain the common purpose of the Council which it had shown since Sunday last. Nevertheless, that effort did not succeed, and we addressed ourselves to the draft resolution placed before us.

91. Ireland is fully aware that the situation in the Middle East is complex. The roots of the Arab-Israeli conflict lie deep in the past. Successive wars have not made it easier to resolve. I have set out several times in the Council the views of my Government as to the basic principles on which we believe any lasting solution to the conflict must be based; I do not need to repeat them here.

92. We want in all sincerity to see the rights of all parties and all peoples in the region reconciled through negotiation and dialogue. We support the idea of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace settlement, and we wish in every way possible to encourage the parties to work towards that.

93. In regard to the particular situation, we are aware that intensive negotiations have been undertaken for some time now to resolve the immediate crisis. These have involved many parties, including the ministers of Arab League States and the special representative of the President of the United States, Mr. Philip Habib. We still hope that these efforts, despite the many difficulties involved, will be successful.

94. Aware, as we are, of the complexity of the underlying issues and of the diplomatic efforts relating to the immediate crisis, we believe that it is essential that there be an end to present fighting, and we support very strongly the idea of United Nations observers to uphold and consolidate the cease-fire.

95. Because of our view that a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute involving the reconciliation of conflicting rights is a matter to be reached by negotiation and dialogue, we have never taken the view that a settlement could be imposed on any party. It must begin with a dialogue, leading to a negotiation, and ending, we hope, in a comprehensive, just and lasting peace settlement. For this reason, we have always had doubts about the wisdom of the use by the international community of the various enforcement provisions of the Charter of the United Nations in this particular dispute. We believe, however, that it is essential that the system established by the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security and the authority of the Council, which is the body, under the Charter, with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, be upheld.

96. Under Articles 24 and 25 of the Charter, all Member States recognize this primary responsibility

of the Council and all Member States agree to accept and to carry out the decisions of the Council in accordance with the Charter. As a member of the Council for a short two-year period, we feel it our duty to uphold this system and to uphold the authority of the Council.

97. Faced with the gravity of the present situation, we therefore carefully considered our attitude to the present draft resolution. We did not feel that the Council could simply accept that its decisions, taken over a period of two months, should remain unimplemented while present fighting, destruction and serious loss of life on both sides continued. We thought it right, therefore, for the Council to signal the seriousness of its intentions, and we therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution, before the Council, which called on States to be prepared, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, to apply certain measures until the authority of the Council was upheld.

98. That is the end of my statement as representative of Ireland. I now resume my function as PRESIDENT.

99. Mr. LOUET (France) (*interpretation from French*): I wish to speak in exercise of my right of reply.

100. I am going to try to reply to the statement made a moment ago by the representative of Israel, although I fear that I may not be as qualified as he to engage in invective. Besides, my respect for the Council prevents me from stooping to that level.

101. It is deplorable that lies, invective and intimidation have become common rhetorical devices in the Council, thanks precisely to that representative. Indeed, this brings back unhappy memories. When I heard references to "shame", "infamy" and "cynicism", I said to myself: "But this is impossible! Let me reread my statement."

102. I found that I said: "my delegation notes that Israel has thus far refused to comply with those resolutions" [*para. 23 above*]. I think that is a moderate statement. Everyone has noted that. Israel itself has said that it is not implementing the resolution. How can the statement that Israel has thus far refused to comply with these resolutions justify such an outburst?

103. I said that the situation in Beirut was tragic. Does that justify such an outburst from Mr. Blum?

104. Finally, I said, in a very brief statement, that my delegation was convinced of the soundness of the measures that were proposed. Does that justify his response?

105. I am dumbfounded at the level to which one must stoop in trying to prove certain arguments. I should like to strike a lower profile, if I may, in

connection with the word "cynicism". I had that word in mind as I listened to Mr. Blum explain, a moment ago, how sad he was over the situation in Lebanon and how his country wished to help Lebanon. That reminded me of a fable of La Fontaine, "The Bear and the Gardener". I think there is someone opposite me who knows what I am getting at.

106. La Fontaine recounts the tale of a bear whose gardener friend was in the habit of sleeping under a tree and upon whose face flies would often alight. To be friendly, the bear would shoo the flies away, but the flies always came back. So the bear took a heroic decision: he picked up an enormous stone and threw it at the face of his friend, who obviously died. The story does not say whether the fly disappeared or not.

107. Need I explain that our Israeli friends are the "friendly" bear; the fly . . . as far as the poor gardener is concerned, I pray that he is still alive.

108. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

109. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): It seems that the inaction—or lack of action, or the prevention of action—in the Council encourages Israel to execute its criminal aggressive designs against the sovereignty of Lebanon and to continue with its campaign of genocide against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples.

110. We shall hold the Council—or, to be more precise, the permanent member that obstructed the functions of the Council today—responsible for any military action by Israel, in particular in or around Beirut, in pursuing its criminal acts of aggression and in resuming its barbarous attacks against Beirut.

111. The PLO still believes that, eventually, the Council will unanimously adopt concrete and effective means to sustain a cease-fire and to put into effect the immediate deployment of United Nations observers as a first step towards the unconditional implementation of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). The Council must not lose sight of its responsibilities. Members of the Council with the power to do so must refrain from obstructing the functions of the Council. Hundreds of thousands of human lives—Palestinian, Lebanese and Israeli alike—must be spared. The mad barbarians, the Judeo-Nazis, must be placed in strait-jackets and not be seated in this chamber.

112. We have been sitting here for a few weeks, and I have sometimes wondered why the representative of the Judeo-Nazis has been constantly directing such a barrage against the Powers that brought about the defeat of nazism, against those that brought about the downfall, collapse and elimination of Hitlerism and against those that gave up the lives of 40 million or more of their citizens in their fight to eliminate

the Nazis. Let me name some: the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, Poland, and today France. Eventually, the turn of the United States will come. I was wondering why there was this outrage against those Powers that defeated the Nazis, that defeated those who started the holocaust. Why are the representatives of Tel Aviv maintaining the holocaust against the Palestinians and against the Lebanese? And then I came across something that might explain it. Power in Tel Aviv is basically with the Herut Party, which is the political creation of the Irgun Zeva'i Leumi, known as the National Military Organization. That organization had a proposal for what it called the solution of the Jewish question in Europe. I shall quote only parts of that solution:

"It is often stated in the speeches and utterances of the leading statesman of National Socialist Germany"—that is, the Nazis—"that a new order in Europe requires as a prerequisite the radical solution of the Jewish question through evacuation (*'Judenreines Europa'*).

"The evacuation of the Jewish masses from Europe is a pre-condition for solving the Jewish question; but this can only be made possible and complete through the settlement of these masses in the home of the Jewish people, Palestine, and through the establishment of a Jewish state in its historical boundaries.

"The solving in this manner of the Jewish problem and thus the bringing about with it of the liberation of the Jewish people once and for all is the objective of the political activity and the years-long struggle of the Jewish freedom movement: the National Military Organization (NMO) (Irgun Zeva'i Leumi) in Palestine.

"The NMO, which is well acquainted with the goodwill of the German Reich Government and its authorities towards Zionist activity inside Germany and towards Zionist emigration plans, is of the opinion that:

"1. Common interests could exist between the establishment of a new order in Europe in conformity with the German concept and the true national aspirations of the Jewish people as they are embodied by the NMO;

"2. Co-operation between the new Germany"—that is, Nazi Germany—"and a renewed folkish-national Hebraium would be possible; and

"3. The establishment of the historical Jewish state on a national and totalitarian basis and bound by a treaty with the German Reich would be in the interest of a maintained and strengthened future German position of power in the Near East.

"Proceeding from these considerations, the [Irgun Zeva'i Leumi] in Palestine, under the condi-

tion that the above-mentioned national aspirations of the Israeli freedom movement are recognized on the side of the German Reich, offers to actively take part in the war on Germany's side.

"This offer by the [Irgun Zeva'i Leumi], covering activity in the military, political and information fields, in Palestine and, according to our determined preparations, outside Palestine, would be connected to the military training and organizing of Jewish manpower in Europe, under the leadership and command of the [Irgun Zeva'i Leumi]. These military units would take part in the fight to conquer Palestine, should such a front be decided upon.

"The indirect participation of the Israeli freedom movement in the new order in Europe, already in the preparatory stage, would be linked with a positive-radical solution of the European Jewish problem in conformity with the above-mentioned national aspirations of the Jewish people. This would extraordinarily strengthen the moral basis of the new order in the eyes of all humanity.

"The co-operation of the Israeli freedom movement would also be along the lines of one of the last speeches of the German Reich Chancellor, in which Hitler emphasized that he would utilize every combination and coalition in order to isolate and defeat England."

The source of that quotation is a book entitled *The Palestine Problem in German Politics, 1899-1945*, by David Yisraeli.

113. Perhaps the members of the Council can find an explanation in that for this intrinsic hatred of the members of the Irgun Zeva'i Leumi for those Powers that gave up millions of lives in their struggle against the Nazis.

114. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Council extended an invitation, at the 2374th meeting, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

115. Mr. MAKSOUD: I should like again to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this very crucial month, when the tragedy in Lebanon is unfolding in an unprecedented manner. Your grace and diplomatic skills, and your tremendous objectivity when today you refocused the debate on this question in its proper framework, are deeply appreciated.

116. I have just been in touch with Beirut and I should like to preface my remarks this afternoon by informing the Council that, while it has been debating a ceasefire and Israel's contempt for various Council resolutions, Israel has been continuing its carnage and

onslaught. Only one and a half hours ago, a whole building of eight floors—and this was reported to me by the father-in-law of the representative of Lebanon—collapsed and more than 250 persons, mostly women and children evacuees from the south of Lebanon, lost their lives.

117. Yesterday a reference was made to Deir Yassin. It is incredible to have to say that the Deir Yassin carnage has shrunk in historical perspective, given the dimensions of the holocaust being inflicted on the people of Beirut. Yet there is built-in indifference to the human tragedy as a logical sequence of Israel's built-in contempt for the international community. Because of its behaviour pattern, Israel considers that the whole world is answerable to it while Israel is accountable to nobody. It is this premise which has introduced the polarization between Israel and its addiction to aggression, expansion and violations of human, national and territorial rights, on the one hand, and the world consensus as a whole, on the other. This is where the polarization lies, and not in the introduction of a draft resolution, whether by the United States or by the Soviet Union. It is the substance of a draft resolution, not its source, that is important. And although there might have been a preference for having an institutional resolution from the Council as a body, the source of a resolution or amendments to it should not constitute a bar to examining it on its merits.

118. However, remarks have been made today concerning which I should like to provide an input of our Arab collective thinking represented by the Arab League. It is interesting that when France submitted its amendment to accommodate any growing consensus, there followed an exercise in semantic acrobatics in which Israel brought back the memory of a colonial period, not realizing that many changes have taken place in the world, and within France itself, and that since that period Algeria has become independent and France has developed the closest of relations with it.

119. We are in a period in which colonialism has lost its legitimacy, not only among the peoples that were colonized but among the peoples that were colonizers. It is this historical evolution which Israel and its Zionist philosophy seems to be missing. Israel seeks to reintroduce colonialism. Therefore, the world community must realize the nature of this onslaught on Lebanon and the Palestinians and see in it further evidence of the pursuit of what the distinguished National Broadcasting Company (NBC) commentator Mr. John Chancellor has described as imperialism.

120. It is also revealing that whenever anybody questions Israel's behaviour, that questioning is treated as residual and lingering anti-Semitism. Thus, Israel seeks not only to silence its critics but to paralyse the international community, as it has been doing since the beginning of the invasion of Lebanon, by

paralysing the various draft resolutions, as if the meetings of the Council must be considered exercises in futility.

121. When it addresses itself to this august body, the whole Arab world takes the Charter of the United Nations seriously, takes the resolutions of this body seriously, takes the requests of this body seriously. And it is dumbfounded when it finds that resolutions are becoming documents in Secretariat drawers and no means and vehicles of implementation are being found. The world community wants to know: is the whole world, gathered in one arena, and the judgement of the world community, irrelevant and incapable of deterring Israel from continuing obvious carnage?

122. For the last few days, the whole thrust of the debate has again been focused on basically marginal issues—a cease-fire, the lifting of the blockade so that the people of Beirut can have water—while so-called PLO strongholds such as the American University of Beirut Hospital have been attacked. It was hit nine times yesterday. Is the American University Hospital, hit nine times by Israel, a PLO stronghold? Is the French Embassy, on Clemenceau Street, a PLO stronghold? Assuming that there are 5,000 Palestinian guerrillas, assuming that Israel is intent on a so-called final solution similar to the Hitlerite final solution, is the whole thing worth while? Is it worth while to destroy buildings, to obliterate an orphanage? Is it worth while turning a whole city that has been the centre of the cultural and intellectual renaissance of the whole Middle East into the rubble that it is today? Is it worth while seeing children stunned, maimed? What kind of peace is going to emerge—and the whole world community wants us to have a comprehensive, just and durable peace—when mothers and fathers are going to see their children maimed for life to accommodate the self-aggrandizing objectives of Israel? One cannot silently witness this unfolding of the most catastrophic events since the Second World War, this deliberate plan of carnage. And yet Israel wants us to be hopeless and wants the members of the Council to be helpless.

123. If Israel can achieve that objective and render us hopeless—because we are targeted by Israel to be a doomed society in Lebanon, and Beirut is targeted to be a doomed city—in order to accommodate its vengeance against Palestinians who have been denied their right to self-determination and against the population of Lebanon which has suffered unprecedented tragedies, then the answer must be clear and unequivocal. We do not want to resign ourselves to hopelessness, and we do not want you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council to resign yourselves to helplessness.

124. Of course, the League of Arab States has undertaken all efforts to accommodate and complement the Council's efforts, and the Jeddah resolutions [*see*

S/15329, annex] have been factored into the Council's consideration and deliberations. As for Mr. Habib's mission, to which the representative of the United States has referred and which we have welcomed and encouraged, every time he comes close to the brink of achieving a breakthrough, Israel torpedoes it. It wants to pre-empt the Habib mission and every other attempt from any quarter to defuse the crisis and the tension. Therefore, we are eager for something to be done as soon as possible, because we can no longer afford the haemorrhaging of our people in Lebanon or the disasters that are continually being inflicted upon us.

125. In spite of the veto that has been cast, we are eager to have the Council remain seized of the necessary priorities, namely, a credible, sustained and effective cease-fire; the lifting of the blockade that is being undertaken by a brutalized army in order to dehumanize the population of Beirut; and the beginning of the emergence of a solution that is dignified and honourable, not only for the people and country of Lebanon, not only for the Palestinians and the various Arab countries, but for this body and the international community.

126. I plead with you, Mr. President, and, through you, with the members of the Council to lose no time in your efforts to bring about a resolution, whatever it might be, that carries within it a credible chance of inhibiting and deterring Israel; otherwise, Israel will have achieved much more than its holocaust of Beirut and the people of Lebanon: it will have achieved its goal of rendering us hopeless and the Council helpless.

127. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

128. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt): I submit that this is not the finest hour for anybody, least of all for the Council. In our opinion, the situation in Lebanon will not benefit from the exercise through which we have gone today.

129. True, operative paragraph 3 of the Soviet draft resolution [*S/15347/Rev.1*], had it been adopted, would have constituted one of the steps and measures needed to check, even to a limited extent, Israeli policies and measures within the framework of its invasion of Lebanon. But the exercise itself was uncalled for at this precise moment, especially in light of the expected United States position. In this respect, I wish to pay a tribute to the President's untiring efforts to contain the situation and put us back on the right track.

130. The question now is: what next? We have at hand a serious situation. We heard only moments ago reports of violations of the cease-fire in Beirut. Other reports indicate that a massive assault against west Beirut is now in progress. I wish to address to

you, Mr. President, and to the Secretary-General a question about the nature of those reports and whether a massive attack has indeed taken or is now taking place, because in that case the Council must act accordingly, and swiftly.

131. The developments in the area and the exercise that we have been witnessing since the early hours of today and are still witnessing behoove us to conclude that only a comprehensive settlement will deal responsibly with this situation. We find no other path but to reaffirm the right of all States in the region to existence and security, in accordance with Council resolution 242 (1967); to affirm the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to self-determination with all its implications, and the right of the PLO to participate in such contacts and negotiations; and to call for mutual and simultaneous recognition between the parties concerned. I have repeated, almost verbatim, words from the draft resolution submitted by Egypt and France [S/15317] at an earlier stage.

132. At this stage of our deliberations, I wish to underline the importance of resorting to the comprehensive approach and, to that end, of taking up the draft resolution submitted by my country and the French Government.

133. The PRESIDENT: I note that the representative of Egypt addressed a question, through me, to the Secretary-General, and I am sure that the representatives of the Secretary-General here have also taken due note of it.

134. There are three further names on the list of speakers, and while I appreciate that the hour is late, I feel it would probably be the wish of members of the Council that we continue to work through the list and finish our proceedings, at least for the moment, by continuing with the present meeting.

135. I therefore call on the representative of Israel.

136. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I intend to be very brief indeed. It is not my intention to address myself to the collective thinking of Mr. Maksoud. There was, however, one remark to which I would like to address myself.

137. Mr. Maksoud, speaking of my country, accused Israel of "imperialism". Members of the Council should know that the imperial Israel to which he referred has a territory smaller than that of such major countries as Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium and Switzerland and roughly approximates the size of the State of New Jersey. The non-imperial Arab States for which he spoke, and on behalf of whose collective thinking he spoke, have a combined territory larger than that of the United States or China, not to speak of their economic resources. So much for Mr. Maksoud's statement.

138. I wish to thank the representative of France for having acquainted us with La Fontaine's fable. I enjoyed it; I would like to carry it one step further. I think it is essential, first of all, that we identify the bear in the fable and that we give it its proper name. I would propose the name Mishka, which I think is very appropriate. It reminds all of us of the Olympic Games in Moscow in 1980, the symbol of which was that very pleasant little bear, Mishka.

139. Now, another Mishka—not so small and not so pleasant—has been roaming the gardens of the Middle East for some time. And not just one garden, but quite a number of gardens. Indeed, he has hit the gardener in one of those countries, directly and indirectly. I am, of course, referring to Lebanon. Here, however, I would like to ask the representative of France—and I regret that he is not here, although I do hope that my question will be relayed to him—what the duty of the gardener's friends are under such circumstances. You see a bear in the garden of your friend, and he is there for a number of years, and he destroys your friend's garden, and you stand by and watch idly, with the utmost indifference, for seven years and more. Is that true friendship, especially when it comes from a traditional friend, of decades and centuries?

140. There is another question with regard to that bear and that gardener of La Fontaine, for that bear also roams the adjacent gardens. What are the gardeners in the other gardens supposed to do? Do they also have to wait until the bear hits them with the rock? And I think I would identify the rock as well: the Syrians and the terrorists. Do other gardeners also have to wait for that? La Fontaine would, no doubt, have had his answers to all these questions.

141. I spoke of a day of shame. Indeed it is, because of the vote that was cast here by the representative of France. He spoke of his statement; he never mentioned his vote. I would like to remind him that when I spoke of a day of infamy, I had his vote in mind.

142. The PRESIDENT: The last speaker is the representative of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

143. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): The gardener of La Fontaine was not as lucky as we are, for we now appear to have too many friends and, indeed, too many bears, for all of them are bears.

144. As the representative of the invaded country—although it is not a member of the Council—I cannot but welcome the proposal to have a cease-fire within the Council, not only between the super-Powers, but seriously and among everybody. We support this because—and let me say this very candidly—we fear that a non-cease-fire in the Council might produce, as it appears already to be producing, further repercussions inside the so-called Lebanese arena or theatre of operations. While thanking those members who expressed their support, and while thanking you,

Mr. President, in particular for your tremendous patience and courage, in whatever form or manner that support is presented, I would address the representative of the United Kingdom in particular and make a concrete proposal. That may not be wholly in order, since I am not a member of the Council, but I make the proposal all the same.

145. I would propose that he consider using his skill and the credit of his country, if encouraged by the President, to initiate another draft resolution that may restore unity—and, I dare say, sanity—in the Council and enable it again to act significantly and to have a forceful and credible impact on the search for a practical peace in Lebanon.

146. Speaking of resolutions in support of Lebanon and of the Council's attitude *vis-à-vis* my country's policy, I would ask the Council's indulgence at this late hour in order that I might specify once more that we do not share the concern of some that the Council has not expressed its support for the policy of Lebanon *vis-à-vis* the non-Lebanese forces. The Council has supported that attitude ever since it adopted resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). Indeed, as I stated earlier today and at previous meetings of the Council, the Council's constant call for the cessation of all military activities in Lebanon and across the Lebanon-Israeli border must be understood in this manner, as a clear invitation by the Council for all non-Lebanese forces to withdraw from Lebanon and as a clear support for Lebanon's policy in this respect.

147. Furthermore, the Council has twice before examined two draft resolutions embodying Lebanon's policy with regard to this issue in particular. I am thinking of the draft resolution submitted by France [S/15255 and Rev. 1 and 2], one which, despite the tremendous patience of the French Ambassador, who was then in the Chair, was not adopted. A second draft resolution that embodies those same principles was recently submitted by Egypt and France [S/15317], and there has been reference here earlier to that initiative.

148. The time may have come—I do not know—for the Council to cast its support for my Government's

policy in a clear and definitive form. As I hinted here before the Council on Wednesday, my delegation is contemplating initiating such a draft resolution, even though it is not a member of the Council. Perhaps other members would like to consider setting forth in full clarity the broad and definitive framework for a solution to this problem, to the problem of Lebanon, to the problem of saving Beirut from a war that seems to be knocking again, not at our door, but in every heart in Lebanon and among Lebanon's friends.

149. Such a draft resolution, embodying in definitive and clear form a proposed solution to the problem, may be a practical way of approaching this situation. Lebanon must have its freedom and strength restored to it. Lebanon proposes this not to challenge the friendship of its friends or to embarrass them or to test their friendship, but merely to indicate that we and all our friends in the world are determined to rebuild a Lebanon for the Lebanese, but not in the shadow of any guns. Unlike La Fontaine's gardener, we have not yet been killed. A Lebanon restored to health and strength is still possible, and it will bear, as always, its Arab responsibilities and will assume fully and freely its mission in regional and international affairs.

150. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to speak and I call on him.

151. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): At the commencement of this meeting, we brought some bad tidings. I am afraid that I have some more bad tidings for this meeting.

152. I have just received news that as of 1830 hours, Beirut time—that is, 1230 hours local time—Israeli tanks opened fire on the areas of Lailaki and Burj Al-Barajneh, and on Fakhani and Hamad streets; Israeli warships simultaneously opened fire with long-range artillery on Mazraa, Burj Abu Haidar, Sanayeh and Hamra. There was an attempt by Israeli tanks to advance on the axis of Museum and Al-Hout streets. I wonder whether that was in the expectation of preventing the Council from taking action.

The meeting rose at 3.35 p.m.